



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,684	07/31/2001	Hung-Yi Lin	3313-0365P-SP	1165

2292 7590 10/22/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

BERCK, KENNETH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917,684

Applicant(s)

LIN ET AL.

Examiner

Ken A Berck

Art Unit

2879

AW

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peng (US 6582984).

Peng discloses (fig 3F, abstract) a method of making an OLED display panel by forming a plurality of grooves on the substrate (300) parallel to a vertical direction, forming a plurality of first electrode lines (310) in the grooves, forming a cavity matrix on the first electrode, filling an organic light-emitting layer (320) in the cavities and forming a plurality of second electrode lines (330) on the substrate parallel to a horizontal direction.

Regarding claim 2, Peng discloses the first electrode lines are made of ITO (column 3, lines 39-45) and the second electrode lines are made of a metal thin film (column 4, lines 12-17).

Regarding claim 3, Peng discloses (column 3, lines 23-33) the grooves and cavity matrix are formed using a laser.

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claim 4, Peng discloses (column 3, lines 33-49) removing the extra part of the indium tin oxide thin film which is on the substrate surface and beyond the top of the grooves.

Regarding claim 7, Peng discloses (column 3, lines 55-65) forming red-green-blue three-color organic light emitting matrix.

Regarding claim 8, Peng discloses the first electrode lines are made of ITO (column 3, lines 39-45) and the second electrode lines are made of a metal thin film (column 4, lines 12-17).

Regarding claim 9, Peng discloses (column 3, lines 23-33) the grooves and cavity matrix are formed using a laser.

Regarding claim 10, Peng discloses (column 3, lines 33-49) removing the extra part of the indium tin oxide thin film which is on the substrate surface and beyond the top of the grooves.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peng (US 6582984) in view of Kian et al. (US 6602790).

Peng discloses all of the above claim limitations but fails to clearly point out using inkjet printing.

Art Unit: 2879

Kian discloses (column 17, lines 3-52) using inkjet printing in order to deposit the hole injection layer within the grooves.

Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of Peng with the inkjet printing in order to deposit the hole injection layer within the grooves, as taught by Kian.

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peng (US 6582984) in view of Burrows et al. (US 6013538).

Peng discloses all of the above claim limitations but fails to clearly point out using thermal evaporation.

Burrows discloses (column 12; lines 34-46) using thermal evaporation to deposit the organic layers is well known in the art.

Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of Peng with thermal evaporation to deposit the organic layers since Burrows states that the deposit method is a preferred well known method.

Art Unit: 2879


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ken A Berck whose telephone number is (703)305-7984. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (703)305-4794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.


kab


NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800